

Date: Sun, 28 Mar 93 04:30:21 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #78
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 28 Mar 93 Volume 93 : Issue 78

Today's Topics:

ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032 (4 msgs)
Autopatch (2 msgs)
Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines (5 msgs)
RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion through 4/25]
The next attack on hams?
third party agreements

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 27 Mar 93 01:09:16 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar26.215952.7977@qualcomm.com> karn@servo.qualcomm.com writes:
>Hmm. A good start, but this seems to assume PBBs. This is
>shortsighted. What about a network that just relays packets, with the
>users providing their own mail hosts?

...not to mention non-digital modes of communication... and, for that matter,
it would seem to require that the BBS sysop validate and approve any messages
originated at his system...

>Only the originating station should be accountable, and no other.

Amen.

Joe Jarrett, K5FOG, and Tom Blackwell, N5GAR, submitted a petition for rulemaking right after the original brouhaha saying, in effect, that. (They actually said that the originating station - be it packet, an FM repeater user, or someone else in a similar situation - should be primarily responsible, and others who retransmit should be secondarily responsible. This was a nod to the fact that the FCC wasn't going to absolve a retransmitter of all responsibility.) I don't remember the RM number right off, but when the text of the PR docket is available, I intend to file comments advocating adoption of Joe and Tom's text instead of what they propose. I suggest others do so as well; I'll post my comments when they're done.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I can understand if it just won't work but I think locking up my system
to tell me this is a little excessive." -- Steve Luzynski

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 1993 20:35:22 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!jreese@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1278@arrl.org> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:
>Note that this proposal is a loosening of the existing rules. As FCC
>sees it now, *every* station participating in automatic forwarding is
>equally and individually responsible for message content. This global
>distribution of accountability was the case both before and after the
>"Eye Bank" case. NPRM 93-154 would remove that accountability from
>forwarding stations after the first one.

>
>Whether that is a good approach is a subject worthy of consideration,
>but I don't think--and I don't believe the FCC thinks--it is related
>to the question of what constitutes allowable content.

It's interesting to me that they have chosen to introduce this NPRM when there is already discussion regarding this same subject for voice repeaters.

I can't remember the RM number, but there is a petition on the books asking the FCC to re-define the way responsibilities are designated with regard to repeater licensees. I wonder why they decided to address the packet auto-forwarding in a separate proceeding...

Does the ARRL support the position that the originating station should bear the responsibility for content, and that the forwarding station should not have to read every message?

--
Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "If it glows...
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | It goes!"

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 93 22:59:41 EST
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!nanovx!dragon!
blackwlf!nj8j!ben@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:

> Note that this proposal is a loosening of the existing rules. As FCC
> sees it now, *every* station participating in automatic forwarding is
> equally and individually responsible for message content. This global
> distribution of accountability was the case both before and after the
> "Eye Bank" case. NPRM 93-154 would remove that accountability from
> forwarding stations after the first one.

Now the next question is does this do anything(for example) for people who put up repeaters, digipeaters or nodes? Exactly what is meant by a 'forwarding network'? I don't have any trouble with the initial BBS being responsible for content(when I sysoped W8SP, I held bulletins that _originated_ from W8SP for review, mainly on the principle that if all sysops did that, just about all illegal-content bulletins would be stopped from forwarding), but if the originating station(as opposed to the originating BBS) reaches the BBS via digipeater(s), is the first digipeater going to be held responsible for the message content?

This is definitely a step in the right direction, it just needs to be thought out a bit more.

Ben NJ8J

+-----+
Ben Coleman NJ8J	"All that is not eternal is
Packet: NJ8J@W4QO.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA	eternally irrelevant."
Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us	
or ben@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com	C. S. Lewis
+-----+

Date: 27 Mar 93 16:34:54 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net

Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:
>
>They aren't the same thing at all. 92-136 addresses *what* is the
>allowable content of transmissions, while this new proposal is
>attempting to define *who* is accountable for that content.
>
>Note that this proposal is a loosening of the existing rules. As FCC
>sees it now, *every* station participating in automatic forwarding is
>equally and individually responsible for message content. This global
>distribution of accountability was the case both before and after the
>"Eye Bank" case. NPRM 93-154 would remove that accountability from
>forwarding stations after the first one.
>

I'm with Jon on this, Paul. It's very clearly a much-needed LOOSENING of the too-strict regulations that have hobbled us as a service to the public for far too long.

This is a GOOD thing.

| | Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.
| |---| The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL
| Luck | Urder National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to
-----| | the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL
KY1T Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.

lhurder@arrl.org Prodigy - MGTS39A, BIX - ARRL,
MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"
Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ) -- Genie ARRL.HQ

Date: Sat, 27 Mar 93 01:00:21 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[Followups to .policy.]

In article <1286@arrl.org> lhurder@arrl.org (Luck Hurder KY1T) writes:
>That's fine for the individual USING the repeater. But the original
>author was curious about the need for the REPEATING device to ID,
>which -- according to the rules -- it certainly must.

>So, yes, it would be easy for the user to ID on voice. Less so for the
>various repeater transmitters...

I went poking through Part 97 the other day, and was surprised to find that
the requirement that the ID actually be audible wasn't in there any more...

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I can understand if it just won't work but I think locking up my system
to tell me this is a little excessive." -- Steve Luzynski

Date: 27 Mar 93 16:38:00 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>[Followups to .policy.]

>

>

>I went poking through Part 97 the other day, and was surprised to find that
>the requirement that the ID actually be audible wasn't in there any more...

>--

Meaning nothing. The wallet and license are still in jeopardy for anyone
choosing not to produce a dercinable (sp?) ID in the prescribed time frames.

| | Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.
| |---| The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL
| uck | urder National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to
-----| | the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL
KY1T Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.

lhurder@arrl.org Prodigy - MGTS39A, BIX - ARRL,
MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"
Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ) -- Genie ARRL.HQ

Date: 26 Mar 93 21:08:51 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Quick question: If a Pager (Beeper) is a radio receiver, does

> it use an oscillator circuit? Are these allowed to be turned on on an
> airplane?

The airline has to decide. This one, like laptops, I think they have much more incentive to do something about as opposed to ham radios and scanners. You should talk to a representative of the airline.

-Ron

Date: Sat, 27 Mar 1993 00:02:26 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!icon.rose.hp.com!
greg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

goldstein,marvin (mgsail@prefect.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:
: Quick question: If a Pager (Beeper) is a radio receiver, does
: it use an oscillator circuit? Are these allowed to be turned on on an
: airplane?
:

If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?

Greg. KD6KGW

: -)

Date: 27 Mar 93 00:41:35 GMT
From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!dr_detroit.llnl.gov!strauch@seismo.css.gov
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com>, greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas) writes:
|> goldstein,marvin (mgsail@prefect.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:
|> : Quick question: If a Pager (Beeper) is a radio receiver, does
|> : it use an oscillator circuit? Are these allowed to be turned on on an
|> : airplane?
|> :
|>
|> If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?
|>
|> Greg. KD6KGW

|>
|> :-)

Probably pick up the Airphone and call them. Same thing we do on the ground
Mark :-)

Date: 27 Mar 1993 14:49:40 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?

Reach forward and pull out the GTE Airphone, call the number, find the signal quality so poor as to be unusable, and then make a beeline to the first payphone I find once getting off the plane...

-Ron

Date: Sun, 28 Mar 1993 02:03:02 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

strauch@dr_detroit.llnl.gov (Mark S. Strauch) writes:
> In article <C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com>, greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas)
> |> goldstein,marvin (mgsail@prefect.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:
> |> : Quick question: If a Pager (Beeper) is a radio receiver, does
> |> : it use an oscillator circuit? Are these allowed to be turned on on an
> |> : airplane?

> |> If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?
> |> :-)

> Probably pick up the Airphone and call them. Same thing we do on the ground
Hmmm. No wonder people get ulcers! Geez, I used to really look
forward to flying so I could get AWAY from people who felt it
necessary to bother me....

What could possibly be *SO* important as to REQUIRE a response from
30,000 feet, let alone the beep in the first place? Forgive me. I am
an Old Fart who has been writing O/S code for 35 years, been a ham for

37, have 2MM (that MILLION for the Latin-impaired ;^) frequent flyer miles, and have learned that peace and quiet and human time are real important, and most things can wait a few hours...

And, technically speaking, YES the pager ***is*** not supposed to be used in the aircraft without permission... However, I am ***sure*** you are too important to be bothered by a rule so obviously meant for less important people! ;^)

Ease up and get a life! Enjoy what you have, while you have a life to enjoy it...hug a kid. teach a youngster about ham radio...and turn the beeper off once in a while or I'll outlive you! ;^)

73

+-----+

Jack GF Hill	Voice: (615) 459-2636	jackhill@jackatak.raider.net
P. O. Box 1685	Modem: (615) 377-5980	Compu\$erve 76427,31
Brentwood, TN 37024	Bicycling and SCUBA Diving	Ham Call: W4PPT

+-----+

Date: 27 Mar 93 00:44:34 GMT

From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion through 4/25]
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The following article was actually the first one I posted on the 18th. The second didn't go out until several days later - without going to the moderated newsgroup news.announce.newgroups.

This should clear up the complaints we had about the other posting not being cross-posted to news.announce.newgroups. And a lesson for me... when a blizzard hits the East Coast while the moderator is moving house, just be patient - it can take a few extra days.

Anyway, this makes the OFFICIAL 30-day discussion period start today, 3/26. Though I see no reason why any discussion already posted to news.groups would be omitted from consideration. Continue with the discussion - there's no doubt the RFD is official now. Official discussion will continue through April 25.

>Path: amdahl!rtech!decwrl!uunet!bounce-back
>From: ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft KD6EUI)
>Newsgroups:

news.announce.newgroups,news.groups,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.packet,rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Subject: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization
>Message-ID: <1ov8nsINN9ii@rodan.UU.NET>
>Date: 26 Mar 93 15:50:20 GMT
>Sender: tale@rodan.UU.NET
>Reply-To: "rec.radio.amateur reorganization mail list" <rra-reorg@amda1.com>
>Followup-To: news.groups
>Organization: UUNET Communications
>Approved: tale@uunet.uu.net

> REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION
> REORGANIZATION OF REC.RADIO.AMATEUR
>[...]

Date: Sat, 27 Mar 93 11:33:17 PST
From: destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!mala.bc.ca!oneb!ham!emd@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The next attack on hams?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

erchul@csd4.csd.uwm.edu (David A. V. Erchul) writes:

> > In article <1993Mar24.192429.15444@news.acns.nwu.edu> lapin@casbah.acns.nwu.
> >>
> >>against it. From the naysayers came the proposal that ALL radio
> >>transmissions be banned within the village limits (except for police and
> >>fire).
>
> After the fact, let's see them enforce that proposal.
>
> cellular phone - get rid of it.
> cordless phone - get rid of it.
> microwave oven - get rid of it.
> garage door opener - get rid of it.
> pager type car alarms - get rid of it.
> all wireless microphones - get rid of it.
> baby monitor - get rid of it.
> walkie talkie kids got for xmas - get rid of it.
> mr microphone kids got for xmas - get rid of it.
> remote control car kids got for xmas - get rid of it.
> remote control boat kids got for xmas - get rid of it.
> remote control plane kids got for xmas - get rid of it.
>
> Most of those people don't seem to notice all of the rf transmissoins
> that are around them every day until you try to make them get rid

> of them.
> Some may not even think that they could survive without the
> first five or six listed above. They just DON'T THINK.
>
> (My opinion only) :-(

And don't forget that really important one - the UHF channel changer that lets you change channels from anywhere in the house.

Robert Smits
VE7EMD
Ladysmith B.C.
e-mail: emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca

There is *no* idiotproof filter.
Idiots are proof against anything!
- Richard Chycoski, VE7CVS

Date: 27 Mar 93 16:32:35 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: third party agreements
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:
>Where can we get a list of those countries with which we (USA) have
>third party agreements?

Just about everywhere. We publish or otherwise make it available on:

1. Compuserve.
2. The ARRL BBS (203 666 0578)
3. GEnie
4. America On Line
5. BIX
6. The ARRL Net Directory
7. The ARRL Operating Manual
8. And (I THINK, anyway) on the ARRL infoserver via Internet E-mail request.

| | Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.
| |---| The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL
| uck | urder National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to
-----| | the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL
KY1T Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.

lhurder@arrl.org Prodigy - MGTS39A, BIX - ARRL,
MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"

Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ) -- Genie ARRL.HQ

Date: Thu, 25 Mar 93 14:01:15 GMT
From: newshub.nosc.mil!vela.acs.oakland.edu!cs.uiuc.edu!wupost!uwm.edu!linac!att!
mcdchg!laidbak!tellab5!balr!ttd.teradyne.com!news@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1o8mvLIINNgb@topaz.bds.com>, <1993Mar18.063843.351@qualcomm.com>, <1993Mar20.153721.17263@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Reduction of the code requirements

In article <1993Mar18.063843.351@qualcomm.com> karn@servo.qualcomm.com (Phil Karn) writes:

>

>That's one thing that really annoys me about the airlines. All sorts
>of newer navigation systems are becoming available, and not only are
>they generally more accurate and reliable than VOR, but they're
>inherently much more immune to interference from consumer electronic
>devices. (I'm thinking mainly about LORAN-C and GPS -- once GPS
>becomes operational both should be installed as backups for each
>other). But no - the airlines would prefer to ban all electronics (not
>just receivers).

On what data do you base your opinion that newer navigation systems are "more accurate" and "more reliable" than VOR ? Loran-C certainly isn't. GPS may be 'as' accurate, but it's not been proven to be more so.

There are other issues involved here too: like an installed base of Millions of VOR Radio's in the fleet, and thousands of VOR stations world-wide.

They "thought they had a better idea" with something called MLS (Microwave Landing System). This was supposed to be more accurate, because it worked in the micro-wave frequencies, not VHF. It finally fell flat - Why ? Because the slight incremental improvement didn't begin to justify the expense of replacing what was already there, that worked well.

There's a saying I'm sure you've heard "If it ain't broke - don't fix it". The current system "ain't broke".

John Rice _|_ K9IJ | "Did I say that?" I must have, but It was
----- (*) ----- | MY opinion only, no one else's...Especially
o/ \o | Not my Employer's....
rice@ttd.teradyne.com | Private Pilot : ASEL, AMEL, IA
| A ham for 30+ years.

Date: Thu, 25 Mar 93 13:51:06 GMT

From: newshub.nosc.mil!vela.acs.oakland.edu!cs.uiuc.edu!wupost!uwm.edu!linac!att!
mcdchg!laidbak!tellab5!balr!ttd.teradyne.com!news@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9303181525.AA08444@ucsd.edu>, <loaa5bINNgnq@topaz.bds.com>, <1993Mar19.023008.15269@qualcomm.com>hg

Subject : Re: No Radios on Airlines

In article <1993Mar19.023008.15269@qualcomm.com>, karn@servo.qualcomm.com (Phil Karn) writes:

> In article <loaa5bINNgnq@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
>>1. They haven't resolved the selective availability issue yet.

>>2. They haven't come out with precise replacements to overlay the GPS
>> procedure on the instrument landing procedures yet.
>

> I'm well aware that GPS is still an "experimental" system. But this
> can't last forever. The Pentagon has sunk many billions of tax
> dollars into GPS, and sooner or later they're going to be forced to
> put up or shut up.

>
> Politically, I just don't see how they can deny its full capabilities
> to civilian users much longer. They sold GPS to Congress over a decade
> ago largely on the basis of the money that could be saved by shutting
> down other civilian radio navigation systems. Until they can satisfy
> the civil aviation users (which means abandoning SA), this will have
> been a fraudulent bait-and-switch game. Sort of like the one NASA
> pulled with the space shuttle.

>
> I expect that in any event Congress will soon tire of the military's
> GPS games and turn it into a fully civilian system within 5-10 years.
>

>
> And I expect (and hope) that Loran-C will still be around indefinitely
> as a backup to GPS. That's a system that's up and fully operational
> now. Only a year or so ago, the FAA and Coast Guard finally filled in
> the "mid continent gaps" in the continental US. Yet how many
> commercial airlines are using it to back up their VORs? Probably not
> many. They only buy what the FAA forces them to buy.

>
> Phil
>

Yeah, but I wouldn't want to fly an approach with Loran-C. Not enough resolution.

John

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #78
